United Nations CRC/C/SR.2099

Convention on the Rights of the Child

Distr.: General
1 February 2016

Original: English

Committee on the Rights of the Child
Seventy-first session

Summary record of the 2099th meeting
Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Wednesday, 27 January 2016, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Mezmur

Contents

Other matters

Informal meeting with States

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of the present document* to the English Translation Section, room E.6040, Palais des Nations, Geneva (trad_sec_eng@unog.ch).

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.16-01247 (E) 010216 010216

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Other matters

Informal meeting with States

1. **The Chair** said that, since the last meeting in June 2015, the Committee had decided to make the informal meeting with States a standing agenda item for its January session so as not to coincide with a session of the Human Rights Council. The Committee attached great importance to its dialogue with States, and the informal meeting was an opportunity to exchange ideas and discuss how the Committee's working methods could be enhanced to increase its effectiveness.

2. Since June 2015, the Committee had considered the reports of approximately 40 States parties. An unprecedented 196 States parties had now ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child, most recently Somalia in October 2015. The Committee welcomed the recent positive developments in relation to children's rights in the United States of America, the only State that was not a party to the Convention: the Supreme Court had ruled that persons sentenced as teenagers to mandatory life imprisonment for murder must have the opportunity to argue for their release from prison; and the President had announced a ban on solitary confinement for juveniles in federal prisons. The number of ratifications of the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict and the Optional Protocol on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography stood at 162 and 171, respectively. While the Committee welcomed those figures, it would like to see universal ratification of those crucial instruments. Meanwhile, the Optional Protocol on a communications procedure had been signed by 50 States and ratified by 24.

3. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 68/268 on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system, the Committee had worked in dual chambers at two sessions in 2015 and was doing so again at the current session. As a result, the backlog of State party reports awaiting consideration had been reduced from more than 100 in March 2013 to between 40 and 50. Recalling one of the issues raised at the previous informal meeting with States, he said that the elements for the elaboration of, and consultations on, general comments endorsed at the meeting of treaty body chairs in San José, Costa Rica, included a provision that advance versions of draft general comments would be shared with States for their input. The Committee was paying close attention to a number of developments, including efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals and the ongoing migration crisis in Europe.

Developments in working methods, including the simplified reporting procedure

4. **Ms. Sandberg** said that the simplified reporting procedure, as set out in General Assembly resolution 68/268, had already been implemented by a number of the treaty bodies. Under the new procedure, the Committee would issue a list of issues "prior to reporting" on which the State party would base its report. The Committee intended to introduce the simplified reporting procedure at some point in 2016; it had not done so earlier because it had been focused on clearing the reporting backlog and the new procedure would require additional work. The Committee would be interested to hear States parties' views based on their experience of the procedure with other treaty bodies. It would not be possible to offer the new procedure to all States parties at once; it might initially be offered to a group of 10 States due to report in a limited time period, perhaps States parties that had already reported three times to the Committee. The new procedure might also be helpful for the one State party that had still never submitted a report to the Committee. Once the selected States had been invited to report under the simplified procedure, they would have a few months to opt

in. The Committee would then give other sources of information, such as the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), national human rights institutions and non-governmental organizations, one year to submit their input on what should be included in the list of issues. The Committee would then need another year to prepare the list of issues and the State party would be given a year to prepare its report. As the whole process would take three years, some of the States parties due to report in 2019 might well be the first to pilot the procedure. The Committee would develop its own methods for drawing up a meaningful list of issues prior to reporting, which would be structured around the nine clusters of the Convention. States parties would be asked to explain what they had done to implement selected recommendations from the Committee's previous concluding observations, to answer questions in the light of information received from other stakeholders, and to mention any other developments. The Committee might indicate to States that opted in to the procedure that it would hold the dialogue as scheduled even if the report was not submitted or was submitted late.

5. **Ms. Čas Svetek** (Slovenia) said that her country's experience with the simplified reporting procedure had been positive to date, and the Committee's plans to introduce it were to be welcomed. She wondered whether the possibility of the Committee proceeding with a review of a particular State party even if the report had been submitted late or not at all would apply only under the simplified reporting procedure or also under the existing procedure.

6. **Mr. Tesfaye** (Ethiopia) commended the Committee on having reduced the reporting backlog. With regard to the simplified reporting procedure, he expressed concern that, if a range of stakeholders were invited to contribute to the list of issues prior to reporting, the Committee might find itself being dictated to by those bodies as to what matters it should raise with States parties.

7. **Ms. Zolotova** (Russian Federation) said that the Russian Federation had been one of the first States parties to follow the simplified reporting procedure with the Committee against Torture, but it had not been a positive experience. In her view, the new procedure was not suitable for States parties that had not already reported under the existing procedure. She supported the idea of structuring the list of issues around the Committee's previous concluding observations and input from other stakeholders, as well as giving States parties the opportunity to raise other issues. It was important to be realistic about the number of questions that a State party, especially a federative State, could reasonably answer within the new word limit imposed under General Assembly resolution 68/268. Under the procedure for the Committee against Torture, the Russian Federation had received a list of issues containing some 70 questions, which it had been expected to answer in a 20-page report. In such cases, apart from the difficulty of answering the questions within the word limit, there was no room for additional issues to be highlighted. More generally, it was important not to delay the dialogue with the State party; if a report was not considered by the Committee for some time due to the backlog, the information it contained might have lost relevance or been overtaken by events.

8. **Ms. Saleem** (Pakistan) said that the Committee was to be commended on having reduced the number of pending reports. She agreed with the representative of the Russian Federation that the number of questions included in the list of issues should be realistic. Did the Committee intend to set an upper limit? While the contribution of United Nations agencies and civil society would be appreciated, she asked whether their input would be incorporated into the Committee's own questions or whether it would be specifically attributed to them in the list of issues.

9. **Mr. Last** (United Kingdom) said that the Committee's intention to introduce the simplified reporting procedure was a welcome development. It was sen ible to proceed

carefully so as to make best use of the new procedure, which would ensure that the focus was on the most pressing issues. He welcomed the Committee's intention to allow UNICEF and other stakeholders sufficient time to provide input, as the Committee's engagement with United Nations agencies and civil society was one of the strong points of its reporting process.

10. **Ms. Vascautan** (Republic of Moldova) commended the Committee on its efforts to reduce the backlog of reports and said that she supported the introduction of the simplified reporting procedure, which had added value both for States parties and the Committee. She would be interested to hear more about how the list of issues would be formulated and whether the Committee intended to involve regional thematic human rights mechanisms in the process.

11. **Mr. Peña Ramos** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that he agreed with other speakers about the importance of drawing on the experiences of the treaty bodies that had already implemented the simplified reporting procedure and of taking account of the word limits for State party reports when compiling the list of issues. He too thought that the new procedure should be offered only to States parties that had already reported under the existing procedure. He would welcome details on how input from other stakeholders and information provided by States parties in the past would be taken into account when drawing up the list of issues.

12. **Mr. Lizano Ortiz** (Costa Rica) said that, as States were expected to implement a large number of recommendations made by the various human rights treaty bodies, the latter should make an effort to ensure their questions and recommendations were consistent across the treaty bodies, concise, well-organized and limited to a reasonable number. Many States lacked the technical capacity to implement the treaty bodies' recommendations. It would therefore be very useful to include in the recommendations an indication of the technical support available through the United Nations system.

13. The backlog of reports to be considered by treaty bodies was so large that, if all the States that were behind in their reporting actually submitted their reports, the system would collapse, as the treaty bodies would be unable to cope with the workload. It was equally impossible for States to follow up on the huge volume of recommendations they received. It was therefore important for the Committee to make its recommendations as specific and succinct as possible, bearing in mind States' other international obligations, such as those related to the Sustainable Development Goals.

14. **Ms. Sandberg** said that the Committee would give further thought to the suggestion that the simplified reporting procedure should be made available only to States that had already submitted at least one report under the standard procedure. When drafting its lists of issues, the Committee drew on information from many stakeholders, including other treaty bodies. Information received from regional bodies could also be very useful.

15. Under the simplified reporting procedure, lists of issues would be divided into three main sections, the last of which would provide an opportunity for States parties to submit information they themselves deemed important regarding their implementation of the Convention. The Committee was very aware of the need to limit the number of questions in its lists of issues and would make every effort to do so.

16. **The Chair** said that the simplified reporting procedure was optional and that States parties could choose to report under the standard procedure instead if they preferred. The experience of other treaty bodies had shown that the simplified procedure offered several advantages for States. Namely, it reduced the burden on States by providing them with detailed guidance on the content they were expected to include in their reports and by consolidating the report and written replies into a single document. In addition, those States that did choose to follow the simplified procedure

were given priority and thus experienced shorter delays in the consideration of their reports.

17. The Committee did make judgement calls as to the credibility of the information it received from stakeholders, and it aimed to ask States only about information that it believed to be well-founded.

18. **Ms. Dunlop** (Brazil) said she welcomed the fact that the Committee was considering creating a space in which States parties could share good practices regarding the implementation of the Committee's recommendations. When asking questions during its dialogues with States parties, the Committee should take into account the limited amount of time available for the States parties to provide answers. It would be very useful if the Committee could cite a source when quoting statistical data.

19. **Ms. Winter** said that, when drawing up its lists of issues, the first thing the Committee considered was whether or not the State party had followed up on the Committee's previous recommendations.

20. **Mr. Salama** (Director, Human Rights Treaties Division, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights) said that the issue of the workload placed on States had been raised a number of times in various forums. Capacity-building was a key component of General Assembly resolution 68/268, and his division had created a team of 16 human rights professionals to carry out capacity-building activities with States. Whereas in the past capacity-building activities had been limited to quick fixes for States with major reporting backlogs, those activities would be greatly expanded, and training events would be held in the Middle East and Asia in 2016.

21. In order to ensure that capacity-building efforts were sustainable, States were encouraged to establish permanent national mechanisms for follow-up on treaty body recommendations. His division would soon be launching a study on the various types of such mechanisms currently in operation. The report on the first two years of implementation of General Assembly resolution 68/268 was currently being finalized, and he urged States that had not yet done so to submit their own observations in that regard.

22. **Mr. Ramadan** (Egypt) said that, while he understood the need to address the huge backlog of reports due for consideration, he was concerned that meeting in dual chambers created inequalities among the States parties. He therefore wished to know for how long the Committee would continue to meet in dual chambers and whether it could suggest ways of solving the problem of unequal treatment. He also wished to hear the Committee's views on the treaty body strengthening process and any suggestions it might have on ways to improve that process.

23. **The Chair** said that, while in 2015 the Committee had held two of its sessions in dual chambers, in 2016 it would meet in dual chambers only during the current session. It had not yet been decided whether the Committee would continue to meet in dual chambers in 2017. The Committee recognized that there were both advantages and disadvantages to meeting in dual chambers, the main advantage being that it did allow the Committee to effectively reduce its backlog of reports.

24. The Committee would take into consideration the suggestion to limit the number of questions it asked in its dialogues with States parties. He was not sure it would be possible to indicate the source of all the data cited, however, as in some cases the shadow reports submitted to the Committee were confidential. The Committee had already made reference to the work of regional treaty bodies and to decisions issued by regional courts, and the importance of engagement with regional bodies had been

emphasized at the most recent annual meeting of chairs of the human rights treaty bodies.

Reporting under the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography and under the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict

25. **Mr. Kotrane** said that, upon ratification of either the Optional Protocol on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography or the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict, States were required to submit an initial report on their implementation of the Optional Protocol in question within two years of its entry into force for the State party. Subsequently, States parties were to include in their periodic reports on the implementation of the Convention updated information on the implementation of the relevant protocol, or protocols. The United States, as the only State that had ratified the two optional protocols but not the Convention, was required to submit a periodic report every five years on its implementation of the optional protocols.

26. The Committee had adopted guidelines explaining which information and statistics the Committee deemed necessary to assess the progress achieved by States parties. While the experience of each State party was of course unique, there were a few difficulties common to a number of States parties.

27. With regard to the implementation of the Optional Protocol on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, one common challenge was that of fully covering in criminal legislation all the acts and activities set out in article 3 of the Optional Protocol. There was often some confusion between child trafficking, which involved physically moving a child from one location to another, and the sale of children, which was a much broader concept. The sale of children could include acts such as engaging a child in forced labour or improperly inducing consent, as an intermediary, for the adoption of a child, and those acts were not always fully covered by States parties' national laws. Other common challenges were related to the rapid development of new technologies, the criminal responsibility of legal persons, extraterritorial jurisdiction in cases where the victim was a national of the State party or the alleged offender was a national of the State party or habitually resided in its territory, and protection of the rights of child victims.

28. As for the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the Committee often had to remind States parties of their obligations regarding the definition of compulsory recruitment as it applied to persons under 18 years of age, the use of children in hostilities and the concept of taking direct part in hostilities. Many States also faced challenges in taking measures to prevent the recruitment of children into non-State armed groups. Moreover, a number of States had failed to include in their periodic reports any information on their follow-up to the recommendations made in the Committee's concluding observations on their initial reports under the optional protocols.

29. **The Chair** said that around 75 reports were overdue under the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict and in excess of 50 under the Optional Protocol on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

30. **Mr. Whelan** (United States of America) said that he believed the treaty bodies had a critical role to play in assisting States to fulfil their obligations under human rights instruments. His country had joined the consensus on General Assembly resolution 68/268, which underscored the importance of the independence of the treaty bodies and condemned reprisals against persons who contributed to their work. The

reporting process was greatly enhanced by the robust participation of civil society. On the matter of his own country's reporting obligations, he pointed out that the United States had recently submitted reports under both optional protocols and looked forward to its dialogue with the Committee.

31. **The Chair** said that it was important to move towards universal ratification of both optional protocols. Some States took the erroneous view that, since they were not involved in any armed conflicts, the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict was not applicable to them. In fact, it covered not only armed conflict but also related issues such as prevention and the treatment of victims. The Optional Protocol on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography was particularly critical in the light of advances in communications technology and of such phenomena as sex tourism and cross-border rights violations.

Other related matters

32. **Ms. Oviedo Fierro** said that the Committee was currently in the process of drafting an additional four general comments. The first, which concerned public spending and the rights of the child, had been the subject of wide-ranging consultations and a second draft was ready for discussion by the Committee, which hoped to approve the final version by May 2016. The second general comment concerned the rights of adolescents and was intended to offer guidance to States for their legislation and policies in that regard. The issue had been discussed with experts and adolescents themselves, and the latest draft was currently being circulated for consultation among States parties. The Committee hoped to approve the final text in September 2016. The third of the proposed new general comments concerned street children. It would analyse the root causes of that phenomenon and provide authoritative guidance to States parties. A first draft had been prepared and would shortly be circulated among experts for their comments and suggestions. The fourth general comment, which would focus on the issue of children and migration, was being drafted jointly with the Committee on Migrant Workers. The process was still at an early stage and funding was being sought to continue the work. She hoped that the general comment on street children would be approved during the course of 2017 so that, by the end of that year, only the general comment on migrant children would still be pending. The Committee was also aware that certain existing general comments were in need of revision and was taking some first steps to address that issue.

33. **The Chair** pointed out that a lot of the work on general comments took place outside the formal time allotted to the Committee for its core activities. Drafting them was a demanding task which sometimes required the Committee to seek external resources, but it was important because general comments helped to improve the implementation of children's rights on the ground.

34. **Ms. Čas Svetek** (Slovenia) said that general comments were an important source of guidance. Was it true that the Committee was contemplating a general comment on children and the environment? If so, she would appreciate further information in that regard.

35. **Ms. Zhong** Jing (China) said that she had serious concerns about the Guidelines against Intimidation or Reprisals, or the "San José Guidelines", endorsed at a meeting of chairs of the human rights treaty bodies in 2015. The Guidelines imposed new obligations on States parties but had been approved without consultation, lacked transparency and exceeded the chairs' mandate. They should not be implemented before a consensus had been reached between States parties and the treaty bodies. She wished to know if the Committee had discussed the Guidelines and whether there would be any consultation with States.

36. **Mr. Lizano Ortíz** (Costa Rica) said that, like the representative of Brazil, he supported the proposal to create a space for States parties to share good practices. Such an initiative would facilitate the work of the Committee and the team of human rights professionals mentioned by Mr. Salama, as well as encourage direct cooperation between States.

37. **Mr. Lungo** (Zambia) said that he was grateful to the Committee for having accommodated Zambia in the current session. Thanks to its successful interaction with the secretariat, his Government had been able to engage in a fruitful interactive dialogue with the Committee, answering all questions despite the time constraints. He looked forward to the introduction of the simplified reporting procedure, but said that the secretariat of the Committee should be careful to engage actively with permanent missions in Geneva so as to ensure that States parties were informed in good time of the list of issues they would be expected to address in their reports.

38. **Mr. Beck** (Germany) said that his Government supported the Optional Protocol on a communications procedure and was lobbying for its ratification. He wished to know how the Committee viewed the ratification process and whether any complaints had been submitted under the procedure. If none had been submitted, what were the reasons?

39. **Mr. Berti Oliva** (Cuba) said that he supported the views expressed by the representative of Brazil concerning the time available for States parties to respond to questions from the Committee. It was important to re-examine that issue in order to improve the quality of the interactive dialogue. He and, he believed, many States parties shared the concerns raised by the representative of China with respect to the San José Guidelines. He wished to draw attention to the fact that certain treaty bodies, although not the Committee, had shown some reluctance to meet with States parties to resolve their doubts and queries about the Guidelines. He was concerned that an atmosphere seemed to have been created wherein meeting with States parties was seen as somehow challenging the independence of the experts, whereas meeting with civil society organizations apparently did not.

40. **Ms. Ershadi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that she wished to reiterate her Government's commitment to the Convention and the two optional protocols to which the Islamic Republic of Iran was a party. She believed that more time should be given for replies to questions raised by the Committee during the interactive dialogue. Each treaty body should limit its work to its own mandate and important documents such as the San José Guidelines should be drafted in a transparent and inclusive manner, with the full and effective engagement of States parties. She would appreciate clarification on the Committee's own position in that regard.

41. **Ms. Zolotova** (Russian Federation) said that she would appreciate further clarification about Ms. Oviedo Fierro's remark that the Committee was seeking funding to continue its work on the general comment on children and migration. She had never heard of funding being required for the drafting of general comments. In the light of the questions raised about the San José Guidelines, she wondered whether the Committee had discussed the procedure for developing such guidelines on other topics. General Assembly resolution 68/268 called for the role of the treaty body chairs to be enhanced, but did the Committee think it was right for the chairs to decide on issues such as the San José Guidelines and then simply present them to their committees for adoption? Would it not be preferable for the treaty body experts to discuss such topics first then have them considered by the chairs?

42. **Mr. Peña Ramos** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that he shared the concerns expressed by previous speakers about the manner in which the San José Guidelines had been formulated. The chairs of the human rights treaty bodies appeared

to have exceeded their mandate. He would therefore appreciate a comment from Committee members on how they saw their own role in the development and adoption of such guidelines.

43. He was also concerned about the limited meeting time his country's delegation had been given to answer the large number of questions posed by Committee members. His delegation had appeared before the Committee in September 2014, and for him the experience had been traumatic, as he had not had nearly enough time to answer all the questions asked. An improved and more effective interactive dialogue was necessary, not least because States parties went to considerable lengths to send high-level delegations to appear before the Committee and discuss the implementation of the Convention with its members. To ensure that progress was made towards the goal shared by all — the promotion of children's rights — the Committee must proceed with impartiality and all due consideration for the States parties to the Convention.

44. **Mr. Redondo Gómez** (Spain) said that his delegation supported the simplified reporting procedure, but nonetheless encouraged the Committee to continue considering all the information available to it, not simply the replies to lists of issues prior to reporting. He was unsure of the soundness of the Committee's decision to work in dual chambers. Was the resulting reduction in the backlog of reports not achieved at too high a cost — namely, possibly inconsistent methods of considering the reports of States parties? He welcomed the news that the Committee intended to evaluate the usefulness of meeting in dual chambers. Civil society organizations played an essential role in the work of the treaty bodies. He therefore encouraged the Committee to continue using them as one of its main sources of information. Lastly, he said that his Government supported the San José Guidelines, as they would provide the treaty bodies with a harmonized method of taking action against intimidation or reprisals.

45. **Mr. Whelan** (United States of America) said that he was eager to hear the Committee's views on the San José Guidelines, which appeared to him to be necessary to preserve the integrity of the reporting process.

46. **Ms. Vascautan** (Republic of Moldova) asked whether the Committee had decided on the theme for the day of general discussion to be held in September 2016.

47. **The Chair** said that the theme of the coming day of general discussion was children's right to a healthy environment. The programme was in preparation.

48. In the context of the preparation of general comments, he said it was "resources", rather than "funding", that were being sought. It was possible that continued work on the general comments would require additional human resources — for interpretation, for example. No general comments other than the four that Ms. Oviedo Fierro had already referred to were in development.

49. **Ms. Winter** said that as the Committee's focal point on issues involving reprisals, intimidation, threats and disappearances, she would be meeting with her counterparts from other treaty bodies to discuss the implications of adopting the San José Guidelines. The Committee was fortunate to have had but one case — and a weak one at that — involving alleged reprisals taken against a person with whom it cooperated.

50. As a rule, major initiatives to be adopted by the Committee, such as the San José Guidelines and the framework for dealing with individual communications, were first discussed in working groups, whose conclusions were submitted to the Chair. The Chair then opened the plenary, so that the entire Committee could consider the initiative. Nothing was ever forced through.

51. **Mr. Madi** said that as there was not always enough time for the delegations of States parties to reply to all the questions put to them, the Committee often asked them to provide written replies to the unanswered questions within a very short period of time. Many States parties complied with the request, and the practice was likely to continue. It seemed to him that one reason that six hours was not always enough for the dialogue was that the three major categories of officials involved in the process — namely, the drafters and compilers of the State party reports, the people who provided the replies to the lists of issues, and the members of the delegations that travelled to Geneva to appear before the Committee — did not always coordinate their efforts.

52. The Committee was currently considering how to address the relationships between children's rights and the Sustainable Development Goals. States parties could therefore expect questions to be raised on that topic in future lists of issues.

53. **Ms. Oviedo Fierro** thanked the participants who had expressed support for the idea of creating a space or forum in which States parties could discuss good practices regarding the implementation of the Committee's recommendations. The Committee could further discuss creating such a space in its meeting with UNICEF, which was to be held on the following day.

54. **Ms. Sandberg** said that although the day of general discussion would not culminate in a general comment on children's right to a healthy environment, it was likely to lead to a number of recommendations.

55. **Mr. Nelson**, referring to the views expressed on the use of dual chambers, stressed that even if the report of a given State party was considered by only half of the Committee, the concluding observations on that report were always adopted by the Committee meeting in plenary.

56. **Ms. Aldoseri** said that the practice of meeting in dual chambers added considerably to Committee members' workload. She therefore hoped that, as the backlog of reports had been reduced, it would no longer be necessary.

57. **The Chair** said that some progress had been made towards more effective time management in meetings with State party delegations. While rules could be agreed on how often and for how long Committee members could take the floor, managing the speaking times of delegation members required a slightly different approach. In any event, the time allotted for the consideration of a State party's report was unlikely to change. As a result, Committee members were already thinking about how the simplified reporting process would help them make the most of their limited time.

58. Fifty States were currently signatories but not yet parties to the Optional Protocol on a communications procedure. Those States had been encouraged by Committee members and other experts to become parties to the Optional Protocol, but it would also be a good idea for officials from States that had ratified it to discuss the experience of ratification or accession with officials from States that had not.

59. Regarding reprisals, he said that the San José Guidelines, which could not be implemented without the involvement of States parties, had a provision entitled "Raising concerns confidentially with State party authorities". Committees had been given all necessary leeway to adopt the Guidelines as they saw fit. In addition, he had travelled to the meeting of the chairs of the human rights treaty bodies in San José with fresh input from Committee members on the draft version of the Guidelines.

60. **Ms. Muhamad Shariff** said that the persons chairing meetings were well aware of the importance of time management. They also had the freedom to limit follow-up questions, so that States parties, in particular those that had not appeared before the Committee for several years, could speak without interruption.

61. **The Chair** thanked the State party representatives present and assured them that their remarks, in particular those concerning the simplified reporting procedure, had been taken on board. He looked forward to seeing them again at the Committee's next day of general discussion and at other informal meetings with States parties.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.